

Appl. No.: 09/994,011  
Amdt. dated: 3/17/2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to more particularly point out the applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the instant amendment, the application is in condition for allowance.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103**


Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Broussard (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,483) in view of Dinwiddie (U.S. Patent No. 6,481,013). It is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, define subject matter not disclosed or suggested by either the Broussard or Dinwiddie patents. More particularly, the applicant agrees that the Broussard patent fails to disclose a remote control device for communicating with a computing platform over a predetermined communication link. In support of the rejection, the Dinwiddie patent was cited for disclosing a remote control device 58. However, it is clear from the Dinwiddie patent that the remote control device 58 does not disclose or suggest a remote control device which includes a display for displaying a list of digital content. As such, it is respectfully submitted that neither the Broussard nor Dinwiddie patents, either singly or in combination, disclose or suggest the invention recited in the claims as amended. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Appl. No.: 09/924,011  
Amdt. dated: 3/17/2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By:

  
John S. Paniagua  
Registration No. 31,051  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
525 W. Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
(312) 902-5200  
(312) 902-1061  
Customer No.: 27160

Page 5 of 5

Doc. # 0001 (2:1748-0:000) 00000000-1, 00000000/Type 10 10